

Appl. No. 10/748,554  
Reply dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2005

**Remarks**

With the present Amendment, claims 1-20 are pending. Claim 20 has previously been withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention. Further, the Examiner has withdrawn claims 12-17 and 19 based on the Applicants' election of Fig. 1 for the election of species required in the earlier Office Action of January 11, 2005 and these claims are therefore shown as withdrawn claims on the attached listing. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the withdrawn claims in this or a continuing application, as appropriate.

Applicants thank Examiner Balsis for including in the Office Action mailed April 25, 2005 signed copies of the initialed Forms PTO-1449 sent with Applicants' Information Disclosure Statements (IDS).

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 6 have been properly amended as shown on the attached listing so that claims 3 and 6 particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claims 1-4, 7, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Truong, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0074520). Claims 1-3, 7 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rivera, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,094,559). Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sandqvist

Appl. No. 10/748,554  
Reply dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2005

(International Publication No. WO 94/23634). Claims 1 and 18 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Penn (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,513).

Further, claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0074520) in view of Childs, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831). Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivera, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,094,559) in view of Childs et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831). Claims 2-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandqvist (International Publication No. WO 94/23634) in view of Childs, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831). Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Penn (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,513) in view of Childs, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831).

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0074520) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702). Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivera, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,094,559) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702). Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandqvist (International Publication No. WO 94/23634) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702). Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Penn (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,513) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702).

Also, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0074520) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702) and further in view of Childs, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831). Claim 11 stands

Appl. No. 10/748,554  
Reply dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2005

rejected under 35U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivera, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,094,559) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702) and further in view of Childs et al (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sandqvist (International Publication No. WO 94/23634) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702) and further in view of Childs, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831). Finally, claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Penn (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,513) in view of Keck, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,702) and further in view of Childs, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0003831).

Respectfully, the cleaning sheet of claim 1 patentably defines over the cited prior art. Specifically, neither Truong, et al., Rivera, et al., Sandqvist, nor Penn, disclose, teach or suggest, in combination or alone, a cleaning sheet having a first side and a second side, with the first side including a first electret treated material with the ability to attract and retain dirt, dust and other debris, and the second side having a material which has the ability to absorb fluids. The first side material is electret treated to enhance its ability to attract and retain particles. In fact, Truong, et al., Rivera, et al., Sandqvist, and Penn actually teach away from such a cleaning sheet.

Truong, et al. disclose a cleaning pad having first cleaning web material on one side and a second cleaning web material on the other side. The first cleaning web material is absorbent to allow for dry, damp, and wet cleaning. The second cleaning web material is designed to perform scouring functions. Both cleaning web materials are constructed to work in a wet environment. Truong, et al. teach that additional layers of absorbent material may be provided between the cleaning webs to increase absorbency through either web (See paragraph 49 of specification). As such, neither of the webs is electret treated.

Appl. No. 10/748,554  
Reply dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2005

Rivera, et al. disclose a cleaning pad with a blotter layer and a scrubber layer. The scrubber layer is used to clean soiled surfaces after wetting. The scrubber layer is described as a porous, nonwoven material that captures particulate material from textured surfaces during a wet scrubbing step. Pouches are provided at the rear surface of the scrubber layer to deliver a liquid cleaning agent through the scrubber layer. The blotter layer includes an absorbent material for absorbing the excess water after the scrubber layer cleans the wetted surface. Therefore, the scrubber layer is configured as a coarse scrubber that loosens particles during a wet scrubbing step. The scrubber layer is not electret treated to attract and retain particles during a dry wiping step.

Sandqvist also discloses a reversible mop cloth having a fluid wiping material on one side and a dry wiping material on the other side which exhibits a fluid absorbing function. The dry wiping material, when turned inwards against the mop, functions to retain and store fluid during wet mopping, and is not electret treated to attract and retain particles.

Penn discloses a "sponge pick-up head" having two sides used for wet cleaning. Penn describes this device as a sponge for wet cleaning having "differing textures" on its opposite faces. Both faces, however, act as a sponge, and neither face is electret treated to attract and retain particles during a dry wiping step.

Truong, et al., Rivera, et al., Sandqvist, and Penn all disclose teach and suggest having two sides that are intended to be used in a wet environment, and neither side is electret treated to attract and retain particles in a dry-wipe step. In contrast, claim 1 of the present application calls for a first side that is electret treated to attract and retain dirt and debris in a dry environment. Therefore, Truong, et al., Rivera, et al., Sandqvist, and Penn cannot

Appl. No. 10/748,554  
Reply dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2005

anticipate claim 1. Further, Truong, et al., Rivera, et al., Sandqvist, and Penn teach away from the use of a first material that is electret treated because of the use of their respective products in wet environments in all modes of operation. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to these references alone or in combination with other references to develop the cleaning sheet of claim 1.

For at least these reasons set forth above, Independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art and is now allowable. Since claims 2-11 and 18 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at her convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

The undersigned may be reached at: 770-587-8908.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURA ELIZABETH KECK ET AL.

By Robert A. Ambrose  
Robert A. Ambrose  
Registration No.: 51,231

#### CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I, Robert A. Ambrose, hereby certify that on July 25, 2005, this document is being faxed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, central facsimile machine at (571) 273-8300.

By Robert A. Ambrose  
Robert A. Ambrose